



Lower A1c and Reduce Hospital/ED Use in Members with Insulin-Treated Type 2 Diabetes (T2D) via Real-Time Continuous Glucose Monitoring (rtCGM)

New clinical and economic evidence highlight the value of rtCGM in optimizing the management of T2D in diverse populations

KAISER REAL WORLD EVIDENCE¹

STUDY DESIGN

KAISER PERMANENTE of N. California

- Propensity score-matched cohort retrospective analysis
- 30,407 members with insulin-treated diabetes
- rtCGM compared with BGM* 12 months pre/post rtCGM initiation

T2D COHORT RESULTS

0.6%
Reduction
in A1c

A1c difference favored rtCGM across all:

- ✓ ages (33-79 years)
- ✓ baseline A1c levels (7.1%-11.6%)
- ✓ education levels
- ✓ diabetes numeracy

51%
Rate reduction
in ED visits and
hospitalizations

“Our real-world study found that in patients with insulin-treated diabetes, initiating a continuous glucose monitor substantially improved blood glucose control and cut the rate of emergency room visits for hypoglycemia in half.”

QUALITY IMPACT

18%

Increase in members meeting HEDIS² measure A1c <8%

The improvement in blood sugar control was comparable to what a patient might experience after starting a new diabetes medication.⁷

- Andrew J. Karter, PhD
Senior Research Scientist with Kaiser Permanente Division of Research

KEY TAKEAWAY

Initiating rtCGM reduced both A1c and hypoglycemia requiring healthcare resource utilization among members with insulin-treated T2D.

Retrospective Analysis of Administrative Claims

▶ An analysis of 571 patients from the Optum Research Database demonstrated a reduction in T2D-related medical costs with rtCGM.³ Access the ADA abstract [here](#).

\$424
PMPM*

*BGM = Blood Glucose Monitoring

MOBILE Randomized Controlled Trial⁴

STUDY DESIGN

- 175 T2D adults treated with basal insulin randomized 2:1 to rtCGM or BGM
- Conducted over 32 weeks at 15 primary care centers

Level A Evidence[§]

RESULTS

- A1c reduction in rtCGM group without a significant increase in insulin doses or non-insulin medications
- Benefits of rtCGM were consistent across diverse racial/ethnic backgrounds comprising **52%** of the study population

QUALITY IMPACT

62%

More participants were able to achieve HEDIS measure A1c <8% using rtCGM compared to optimized BGM

	rtCGM [†]	Optimized BGM [‡]
Participants able to meet A1c <8%	63%	39%
Time Spent in Target Range (70-180 mg/dL)	59% (3.6 hours more/day)	43%
Time Spent in Hyperglycemia (>250 mg/dL)	11% (3.8 hours less/day)	27%
Mean glucose levels	179 mg/dL	206 mg/dL

1.1%
A1c reduction
from baseline
with rtCGM

Statistically significant difference between both groups

[†] Participants in the rtCGM group were provided with a Dexcom G6 CGM System

[‡] 1 to 3 fingersticks daily

KEY TAKEAWAY

rtCGM, as compared with BGM, reduced A1c and improved glycemic control in adults with T2D treated with basal insulin in primary care.

Emerging practice guidelines from [ACE](#) and [ADA](#) likewise highlight the benefit of covering rtCGM for plan members with T2D treated with any insulin therapy.^{5,6}

CALL TO ACTION

The time has come to broaden access to CGM for patients with type 2 diabetes.⁸

– Monica Peek, MD, MPH, Associate Director, Chicago Center for Diabetes Translational Research

*PMPM = Per Member Per Month

[§]American Diabetes Association (ADA) level A evidence = clear evidence from well-conducted, generalizable randomized controlled trials that are adequately powered.

1. Karter, AJ. JAMA (2021): <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2021.6530>. 2. "NCQA. HEDIS Measures for Comprehensive Diabetes Care. <https://www.ncqa.org/hedis/measures/comprehensive-diabetes-care/>. 3. Norman, GJ. Diabetes (2021): <https://doi.org/10.2337/db21-66-LB>. 4. Martens, T. JAMA (2021): <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2021.7444>. 5. Grunberger, G. Endocr Pract (2021): <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eprac.2021.04.008>. 6. American Diabetes Association. Diabetes Care (2021): <https://doi.org/10.2337/dc21-S007>. 7. Healio. <https://www.healio.com/news/endocrinology/20210607/realtime-cgm-lowers-a1c-reduces-ed-visits-in-insulintreated-diabetes>. 8. Peek ME, Thomas CC. JAMA. 2021;325(22):2255-2257. doi:10.1001/jama.2021.6208.